

I
I
I
I
I
I
I
I
I
I
I
I

2:23-cv-750-ACA

Plaintiff Trenton Garmon filed this lawsuit on his own behalf and, purportedly, on behalf of his minor children, naming as defendants Robert E. Lee County, Florida; Henderson, Franklin, Starnes & Hold, PA; and the Florida Department of Revenue. (Doc. 1 at 1–2). His complaint appears to challenge a Florida state court’s custody and alimony determinations as well as ancillary court actions. (*See, e.g., id.* at 17–18). After reviewing his complaint, the court found it to be a shotgun pleading and ordered Mr. Garmon to replead it. (Doc. 6). The court described in detail why the complaint was a shotgun pleading and explained how to correct the deficiencies. (*Id.* at 3–5). The court warned Mr. Garmon that failure to correct the pleading deficiencies could result in a dismissal with prejudice. (*Id.* at 5).

Mr. Garmon has not filed an amended complaint. Instead, he filed a rambling and incoherent response. (Doc. 9 at 1–6). In it, he requests an additional fourteen days to respond, along with instructions about how many pages his complaint may be and the maximum number of claims he may assert. (*Id.* at 4). The court **DENIES** the request for an extension of time. The court already gave Mr. Garmon almost two months to file his amended pleading. Mr. Garmon has offered no reason why that amount of time was insufficient or how an extension of time will allow him to comply with the court’s order.

Moreover, given Mr. Garmon’s failure to file an amended complaint that complies with the court’s order, the court **WILL DISMISS** this action **WITH PREJUDICE**. *See Vibe Micro, Inc. v. Shabanets*, 878 F.3d 1291, 1295 (11th Cir. 2018). The court will enter a separate final order consistent with this opinion.

DONE and **ORDERED** this August 9, 2023.



ANNEMARIE CARNEY AXON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE